

### REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 28, 2003. Claims 1-35 are presented for examination, and have been amended to define more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 1, 8, 10, 12, 14, 19, 21, 23, 25, 30, 32, and 34 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,097,429 (*Seeley et al.*), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,943,478 (*Aggarwal et al.*).

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, 10, 12, 14, 19, 21, 23, 25, 30, 32, and 34 in terms that more clearly define what he regards as his invention. Applicant submits that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in claim 1 is a server making it possible for a remote client to control an image sensing device via a communication medium and for controlling to transfer of video information, which has been captured by the image sensing device, to the client via the communication medium. The server includes an input device and a notification device. The input device enters a request, generated by a user different from the client, for acquiring information that identifies the client to which the video information captured by the image sensing device is transferred. The notification device, responsive to the entered request, reports the information identifying the client to the user.

One important feature of claim 1 is the server controlling to transfer video information, which has been captured by the image sensing device, and notifying, responsive

to an entered request from a user different from the client, information identifying the client to the user.

The applied art, alone or in combination, is not seen to disclose or suggest the invention as defined by independent claim 1.

As discussed previously in the Amendment After Final Rejection And Petition For Extension Of Time dated March 6, 2003, *Seeley et al.* relates to a video security system physically located at a site being protected. In particular, *Seeley et al.* relates to an interface between one or more cameras positioned about the protected site for monitoring purposes, and an alarm unit, as well as the interface between a camera and a remote operator. In the *Seeley et al.* system, the remote operator requesting a visual verification of the alarm condition from the nearest camera (column 9, lines 6-9) is also the same user who can establish the communication link. Furthermore, the information obtained after establishing communication is merely about an object that has been captured by the one or more cameras, not notifying, responsive to an entered request from a user different from the client, information identifying the client to the user, as recited in claim 1.

For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over *Seeley et al.*, taken alone.

*Aggarwal et al.* is not seen to remedy the deficiencies of *Seeley et al.* *Aggarwal et al.* relates to a system for performing immediate point-to-point messaging over the Internet. *Aggarwal et al.* teaches a technique for displaying lists which identifies the users that are logged on. In the *Aggarwal et al.* system, when a user logs on or out of a server, the system notifies a user(s) or server(s), other than the server being logged on or out. However, nothing has been found in *Aggarwal et al.* that would teach or suggest notifying, responsive to

an entered request from a user different from the client, information identifying the client to the user, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, even if *Seeley et al.* and *Aggarwal et al.* were combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action, assuming such combination would even be permissible, the resulting combination also would fail to teach or suggest at least those features of claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over *Seeley et al.* and *Aggarwal et al.*, whether considered separately or in any proper combination.

Independent claims 8, 10, and 12 are method, storage medium, and system claims respectively corresponding to server claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with claim 1. Additionally, independent claims 14, 19, 21, and 23 include a similar feature of reporting information to the user, as discussed above in connection with claim 1, and in particular, reporting information relating to an object whose image is being sensed by the image sensing device to the user who is not the client. Accordingly, claims 14, 19, 21, and 23 are believed to be patentable for reasons substantially similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in claim 25 is a server making it possible for a remote client to control an image sensing device via a communication medium and for controlling to transfer video information, which has been captured by the image sensing device, to the client via the communication medium. The server includes a storage device, an input device, and a notification device. The storage device stores information relating to objects in a zone within which images can be sensed by controlling the image sensing device. The input device enters a desired position in the video being captured by the image sensing device, and the notification device extracts, from the storage device,

information relating to an object corresponding to the position entered by the input device, and reports the extracted information.

One important feature of claim 25 is to, when inputting a desired position in the video being captured by the image sensing device, extract, from the storage device, which stores information relating to objects in a zone within which images can be sensed by controlling the image sensing device, information relating to an object corresponding to the entered position, and reporting the extracted information.

The applied art, alone or in combination, is not seen to disclose or suggest the invention as defined by independent claim 1.

In *Seeley et al.*, a request entered by an operator is used to verify an alarm condition of non-imaging sensor, rather than a desired position in captured video. *Aggarwal et al.* is also silent about entering a desired position in captured video. Accordingly, nothing has been found in either *Seeley et al.* or *Aggarwal et al.* that would teach or suggest inputting a desired position in the video being captured by the image sensing device, extracting, from the storage device, which stores information relating to objects in a zone within which images can be sensed by controlling the image sensing device, information relating to an object corresponding to the entered position, and reporting the extracted information, as recited in claim 25.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 25 is patentable over *Seeley et al.* and *Aggarwal et al.*, whether considered separately or in any proper combination.

Independent claims 30, 32, and 34 are method, storage medium, and system claims respectively corresponding to server claim 25, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with claim 25.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
NYMAIN385244